DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 275 TE 002 955

AUTHOR	Douglas, Wallace W.
TITLE	English Curriculum Study and Dissemination Center. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-7-0655
PUB DATE	Sep 70
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-070655-2812
NOTE	52p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Change; Community Involvement; *Composition (Literary); Cooperative Programs; Creativity; *Curriculum Study Centers; *English Curriculum; *Inservice Teacher Education; Problem Solving; Resource Centers; Universities

ABSTRACT

This report describes in some detail the changes in work patterns and purposes that occurred in one curriculum study center, with an original charge to make recommendations to the schools about the curriculum in composition, as it became, in effect, a teacher/ school resource center, located in a university. The report is important as a record of creative local action, involving school and university personnel (and latterly, community representatives) in co-operative work to deal with school-university problems in indigenous form. The report also specifies the form of the in-service education program for teachers that, of the various ones tried at the Center, seemed to the staff to offer the best possibility of successful use elsewhere. The report makes clear the precise ends in changed teacher behavior that were to be sought; and it shows the necessary relation between such ends and the means that were developed, independence as the end being indissolubly linked with the growth of independence in and through the means. (Author)

BR 7-0655
PA 24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CS

ED 064275

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-0655
Grant No. OEC 0-8-070655-2812

ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDY AND DISSEMINATION CENTER

Wallace W. Douglas
Northwestern University
1809 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201

September 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE 002 955

ED 064275

Final Report

Project No. 7-0655
Grant No. OEC 0-8-070655-2812

English Curriculum Study and Dissemination Center

Wallace W. Douglas

Northwestern University

Evanston, Illinois 60201

September 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE 002 955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY. i

INTRODUCTION. 1

METHODS. 11

RESULTS. 33

CONCLUSION. 34

REFERENCES. 35

APPENDIX

Illustration A. . . . . a

Resource Materials. . . . . b

Bibliography of Videotapes. c

SUMMARY

This report describes in some detail the changes in work patterns and purposes that occurred in one curriculum study center, with an original charge to make recommendations to the schools about the curriculum in composition, as it became, in effect, a teacher/school resource center, located in a university. The report is important as a record of creative local action, involving school and university personnel (and latterly, community representatives) in co-operative work to deal with school-university problems in indigenous form. The report also specifies the form of the in-service education program for teachers that, of the various ones tried at the Center, seemed to the staff to offer the best possibility of successful use elsewhere. The report makes clear the precise ends in changed teacher behavior that were to be sought; and it shows the necessary relation between such ends and the means that were developed, independence as the end being indissolubly linked with the growth of independence in and through the means, or so it has come to seem to the members of the Center staff.

Introduction

The Northwestern English Curriculum Center was established in 1963, one of five such centers in Project English, where the relation (or, ex hypothesi, non-relation) between the teaching materials of school English and the discipline of English were to be studied by subject matter specialists, who were then, in collaboration with select classroom teachers, to develop new and improved materials to be used by the majority of teachers.

The image is clear enough. In universities there are scholars, "believers in pure research and scholarship, uncontaminated by any application";[1] and it is their special role to develop the Knowledge by which a Discipline is constituted. In universities there are others who are perhaps not quite full scholars, are rather hautes vulgarisateurs, and their role is the diffusion of Knowledge, or the application of what has been developed by scholars. Then, in the schools, there are teachers with special skill in the art of teaching, with special expertise in creating forms and circumstances which will make teaching effective. And also in the schools, there are others whose role it is to receive actual and practical teaching materials from the hands of the collaborating select teachers and subject matter specialists, who have themselves been provided with the discoveries of the scholars.

Simple reflection and disinterested inspection will prove (test) the accuracy of that description. But note also the formulation of Paul Olson's opening disclaimer in his remarks at the Grove Park Institute:[2]

> I should say that before I was either a student of elementary education or a student of the English curriculum, I was a medievalist. I continue to work as a medievalist; I teach graduate students and direct dissertations. I write in my area of specialization. . .
>
> Those of us who are here probably think of ourselves as here on a side-road; we think of our concern for the schools as a momentary or long-term diversion accessory to our primary concerns as scholars and graduate advisors and teachers.[3]

Project English began in 1961-62. The Grove Park

Institute met 10-15 June 1969. The former was designed to bring into the school teaching tradition, in substantially faithful form, the new conceptions of language and speech, the new--or revised--systems for treating literary works, and the new--or revived--techniques for developing the formal expressive and communicative skills of young people, which had been absorbed into the collegiate teaching tradition, or sectors of it, over the preceding thirty or forty years. The latter, the Institute at Grove Park, was charged "to consider what should be done about the role of the disciplines in the continuum of teacher education."[4]

The problem was posed again, and in the same free terms, by Saul Cohen,[5] in the speech he gave to open the conference.

> The purpose of this conference is to reassess the nature and extent of the commitment of scholarly disciplines to the teaching enterprise. To date, most of this commitment has been expressed through the actions of small, often isolated, numbers of individuals, operating within the confines of their scholarly disciplines. . . .
>
> To reassess our commitment we are going to have to think through a variety of educational, social and even political issues. We can no longer ask such narrow questions as: "How can professional historians see to it that better history is taught in the schools and colleges?" or "How can better-trained biologists be induced to enter teaching ranks, given adequate curricular materials?" For these are ego-centric questions. They fail to grapple with such central issues as the purpose of the educational enterprise, the relationships between the educational enterprise and society, and the specific responsibilities that professional scholardom has to the university in whose milieu scholardom must either thrive or languish.[5]

Elsewhere Dean Cohen remarked that the charge to the conference was "in many ways vague and ambiguous."[6] And indeed the openness of the charge does astound. Especially impressive are Dean Cohen's two questions. And it cannot easily be denied that the professional community has been brought to the position of asking such

questions, in part at least, by the experience gained through the Project English Curriculum Study Centers and other Federally funded programs in the continuing education of teachers. For in that often trying and frustrating experience "individual college professors [did learn that] they could help school teachers, and that this was a challengingly difficult job which needed to be done better."[7] They learned something else, too; those of them who got into the schools did anyway. They began to see teachers, not merely to talk about them. They saw

> hostile teachers, tired teachers, frustrated teachers, anxious teachers, teachers who resent, justifiably, the esoteric and academic presumptions of many of us who are out of the classroom, safe from the discipline problems, from the harassment of the community and from the exhausting schedule of meetings and the very trying inter-personal relationships.[8]

And seeing such teachers and such conditions, to say nothing of the "tension, turmoil, and turbulence"[9] among children in school, they began to re-think the problem of improving the schools by what is called in-service training.

As a result they began to look also at themselves, as it were; or rather at the pre-service training that had produced the teachers who were in need of in-service training. What they saw has been well described by Professor Vernon Haubrich, of the University of Wisconsin, at the Grove Park Institute:

> The model and structure of the university to which the prospective teacher is subjected while in college is the very same model adopted by teacher educators, secondary schools, and increasingly, elementary schools. This model is based on the historic nineteenth and twentieth century German university and emphasizes specialization, graduate domination, departmentalization, the accounting system of grades, hours, and credits, and above all, a remoteness, an aloofness which permeates the entire structure under such names as "academic," "detached," "scholarship," or various combinations thereof. . . . There has been a general emulation of this model to such an extent that teacher educators per se (the educationists) often never

> get near a public school, see teaching or learning, or have much to do with preparing teachers. The research bug has bit one and all.[10]

In anyone aware of entropy and of the power of systemic defenses in bureaucracies, that analysis is likely to produce despair, at the least, if not some more profound retreat. No doubt it is a tribute to the American character that that has not in fact been the case. Grove Park produced not only Dean Cohen's generous and receptive talk, there was also to be heard--from time to time, more often in informal conversation than in prepared speeches--an insistence upon the fact that "the disciplines [must] examine and re-interpret their use in the schools";[11] that is, that some self-examination is necessary. And the report of the English Group, which was called "Change in English," suggested that recently "the prevailing view of English has been seriously challenged, a new view has been demanded, and a new view has been slowly emerging." The old view that was referred to in the report was that of English as a "content" subject, and expecially the view of content that had been given the profession by the Basic Issues Conference in 1958.

The new view is one being developed, haltingly no doubt but still with some certainty, by concerned teachers and academicians around the country. In this view

> English is less a subject for study than it is an activity, or a set of activities, more or less directed, more or less purposeful--actitities that allow children to explore, to try out, their various uses of language, from the everyday to the artistic, and to grow in and through such explorings, such tryings. Here English is a child reading, writing, talking; responding, expressing, explaining, sorting out; communicating, discovering, thinking. Here English is a new curriculum, responsive to children as children (not as incomplete adults), directed to the imagination as well as the intellect, providing occasion for free use of the child's own language as the medium of learning (though not necessarily of instruction), and treating literary works not only as sources of pleasure but also as occasions for exploration of human experiences. Here English is a new teacher aware of the social implications of English in all aspects: listening, talking, writing,

and reading.[12]

The Report continues with a comment on the kind of education for teaching that would seem to be presupposed by the developing New English. According to the Report, the skills needed by English teachers "are, on the whole, quite different from those generally included" in pre-service programs.

> As the Grove Park Statement implies, the so-called "New English" requires teachers whose knowledge and abilities go beyond subject matter skills to embrace an understanding of children, their needs, interests and concerns.[13]

In short the Curriculum Center has existed through a period that has seen the beginning of a nearly total revision of the "problem" of improving the schools. Now, for example, one is tempted, indeed almost compelled, to write "improving the life that goes on in the schools," instead of that bleak and institutional "the schools." More seriously, the problem is now seen as having two parts. First, it is beginning to be granted that the relation between university and school must be changed so as to become more truly cooperative. This means of course that a re-examination of the undergraduate education of teachers will be necessary, and that especially by the subject matter departments. Such a re-examination will be very difficult indeed for departments with a strong tradition of training young people for jobs in universities and colleges; that is, those with a strong tradition of graduate study.

A second part of the problem results from the reconsideration of "English," the school subject that is now going on. It has to be said that this consideration is a radical one, involving not merely techniques and materials, but in fact basic definitions and assumptions. The question "What is 'English'?" is, obviously, not a very answerable one. But the question "What do we mean by 'English'?" is. And so are the questions "What are the effects of the way we use 'English'?" and "What would be the effects [on children and teachers, on society] if we used 'English' in different contexts, to refer to different behaviors than we now do?" It is a real question, too, to ask, as Paul Olson and others have been asking, how what is being done now in 'English'

contributes, in any sense, to the development of a concern for the quality of civil life, for its moral and aesthetic quality.[14]

It is real, too, to say with James Miller, of the University of Chicago, in his Presidential Address to the National Council of Teachers of English, November 26, 1970:

> Emerson wrote: "Imagination is not a talent of some men but is the health of every man." He might have written also, Imagination is the health of the society, the endurance of civilization, the survival of the world. If we were to save the world, we must begin by saving that which makes the world a world--the human. What can an English teacher do? What can a single individual do? The individual English teacher must first realize that the stuff of survival--communication and imagination--are the subjects in his care. If he does not accept responsibility for them, no one else will.[15]

But, it may well be noted by the cynical, English teachers have always accepted that responsibility, or have asserted that they did. They have also of course taken on some fairly social-utilitarian responsibilities: training children in the prestige dialect, in the forms of business and social correspondence and of public (and published) discourse, in the skills necessary to success in college ("research" papers in seventh grade), and in the myths or values of the, or even, often, their, culture. In practice such rather simple behavioral objectives have been treated as sufficient ends for "English"; but often, at the same time, in discussion they have been subordinated to means leading to various ideological and assimilationist ends. It is precisely to this confusion that the criticism of men like Olson and Miller is directed. They are saying that English-work is incapable of achieving even those simple goals now asserted for it, let alone the ones they are interested in. Indeed, in the case of Olson, the charge is graver: that the present content of English-work is anti-social and de-humanizing; it fails minority peoples by ignoring their cultures, and it fails majority peoples (whoever they may be) because it is based on uniformitarian assumptions about, first, Culture and, second, what the skills, attitudes, and behaviors are that are necessary to be upward bound on

the main stream of American society.

For three reasons it has seemed appropriate to begin this Report with a brief historical review. For one thing, the Center has been in existence for something more than seven years; and necessarily, therefore, it has acquired a history and become an item in history. Moreover, the history of English, the school subject, has not yet been done in any completeness; indeed it can be said that the data for that work have still to be gathered. It is to be hoped, then, that this Report may serve as first or second order evidence for some future historian.

A second reason for trying to give the Center a historical place is to help current readers to understand the way the Center has developed, and some of the circumstances that have influenced those who have worked there. Without ever abandoning the terms on which they worked during the first contract period (1962-67), the staff of the Center have certainly expanded their notion of what composition is, or may be, and concurrently their conceptions of what may be valuable in classroom writing and of where such value is to be sought. These changes in theory and moral validation have, of course, forced changes in what the staff have tried to accomplish in the way of increasing the knowledge and improving the classroom techniques of teachers. Indeed, as has perhaps already been indicated, over the years members of the Center staff, working with teachers and supervisory officials in area schools, have come to see in-service training as quite a different sort of enterprise than they had first supposed it. Their change in attitude and conception may be reflected in the fact that they now tend to think less of in-service training and more of continuing education for teachers.

The third reason for the historical sketch is a very simple and prudential one. It allows the presentation of a certain amount of argument from authority or, less defensively, an indication of the status and reputation of the professional leaders who have influenced work at the Center. The sketch also indicates that, at least at the upper levels of the academic hierarchies, there has been very serious and wide-spread concern about the preparation of school teachers. It may be that this concern has been most clearly articulated by those in English. The Gull Lake Report, for example, notes that

university English departments

> have allowed to develop--even encouraged--a gulf between [themselves] and the teachers of English in primary and secondary schools and in community and junior colleges. When we find ourselves condemning the students who come to us unprepared, we must ask ourselves how we have prepared their teachers.

Finally. It must be said that these reflections are neither mere speculations nor just personal opinion. They are the result of the observation and reading that were necessary in carrying on the work of the Curriculum Center. A good many conversations with teachers have contributed too, and information of the kind one gets at national meetings has also been useful. And, as more and more such material has been "put in," the Center staff have been able (or is "forced" the word?) to reshape at least, perhaps in fact to sharpen, the problem they were working on. Or perhaps it is that they have come to see that the problem has a component outside the schools; and if this component is left unattended, (and unnoticed), reform of English-work in the schools will be at best insufficient and may be simply transitory. And this is so whether the reform be designed to improve curriculum content or to bring about change in the very notion of the curriculum.

The original charge to the Curriculum Center remains firm: work to bring teachers into contact with the best of what little is known about the relations between children and writing and, to a lesser degree, literary works--such work is still going on, and will continue. But causes must be attacked as well as symptoms. And the cause is, precisely, in the source of the remedy; that is, in the disciplines themselves, perhaps nowhere more so than in English. Whether Bruner's notion (following Bagley?) that there should be a "pedagogical physics" on the analogy of theoretical, experimental, and applied physics, and so a "pedagogical English" on the analogy of, e.g., the medieval, Renaissance, or Victorian "periods" of English studies in literature--whether that notion is good or bad, no doubt remains to be determined. But right now observation of teachers at all levels, from kindergarten through high school, confirms the truth of Fenton's suggestion that "every college subject course becomes an implicit methods course," in that such courses offer the primary model of teaching a subject. They do what no methods course,

general or special, can do. They allow future teachers a chance to see a teacher in action with the materials of the subject. That the teacher, even the assistant and instructor, is clothed with the authority of collegiate status and the dignity of advanced study only compounds the power of the image.

Yet common sense suggests that teachers in today's schools--with "the crowded corridors, the noisy corridors, the peeling paint, too little equipment, too few tools of instruction, too much tension, turmoil, turbulence," and subject to diffuse and contradictory pressures from the alienated, demoralized, destroyed minority communities of the United States--such teachers are not really going to find much of use in a teaching technique and conception of teacher's role that descend to their practitioners quite directly, and with only scattered criticisms by a Pestalozzi, a Dewey, a Neill, from the rhetorical schools of Rome and the academies and universities of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance. What is the free man of the liberal arts to the members of our minority groups in the United States, among whom, by the way, must be included the greater number of persons now teaching? Common sense may also make us suspect that the same question must be asked about the subject matter of school English, which bears the same relation to the college subject English as school teaching does to college teaching, which has a similar origin, and which therefore may be similarly irrelevant to actual needs of teachers and children in schools.

It must be remembered that every college student is going to take an English course, to fulfill a freshman, general education, distributional, or major requirement. Kindergarten, primary, middle, secondary--it makes no matter--every single teacher in the schools and those to come will be touched by collegiate English work. Their conceptions of language, their notions of received speech, their view of the literary canon, their literary values and estimate of the literary hierarchy, their attitude to "writing" as found in "papers," their evaluation of students and their work will be at least affected and in some cases (secondary school teachers and any others who have been English majors) will be largely determined by what happens in their English work.

In the light of this analysis, the Curriculum Center staff came to believe that their work must be two-directional. There is first, in order of time if not

importance the job of determining tactful and supportive means to help with the continuing education of teachers. How can a university adjunct work <u>with</u> teachers, supervisors, and community representatives to improve the lot of school children? Second, there is the job of persuading their colleagues to examine their own activities in relation to the needs of those in their constituency who are preparing themselves for at least a period of school work. For such an examination to be most useful it must include some investigation of the demands now being made on the schools, with ever-increasing force, by members of minority groups seeking to make teachers and the educational system as a whole more responsive to the human needs of their children.

Methods

It is appropriate now to consider the measures that have been taken at the Center in effort to deal with the problem and circumstances that have been described in the Introduction. Readers should remember that the purpose of this Report is to establish a record that will be useful, in the first place, to historians and, second, to persons currently engaged by the condition of the schools. For the latter group, it is to be hoped, the Report will provide helpful information about the kind of activities that have worked, more or less, in relation to the ends that have been sought.

Work Within the University

Change in universities is often hard to notice, and gain even harder to be sure about. So one does not want to exaggerate the importance of a few objective signs, taking them for wonders. But some things have happened in the English Department at Northwestern that may be significant, or at least can be built on. For one thing, the departmental committee on courses in general education has recommended, and the Department has accepted, two new summer session courses, one in the novel, the other in poetry, which are to be directed to the interests of teachers. There is good chance that similar courses will soon be recommended for the undergraduate offering. Taken with the course in Practical Rhetoric (really, teaching composition in the schools), which was introduced some years ago, these are impressive evidence that the English Department is making a significant effort to develop its offering in English Education.

In another significant move in this direction, members of the Department have had some discussions with representatives of the College of DuPage, a two-year community college, which is entering upon a most interesting experiment in curriculum design. The proposal is to establish an internship plan for Northwestern graduate students. Necessarily this will mean some cooperation between the two faculties in planning the internship and preparing the graduate students for it. And it may lead to something that was already being discussed, summer institutes for two-year faculty.

There is some reason to think that these actions represent an actual qualitative change in the thinking of at least some members of the Department. The evidence is

informal: a word here, a phrase or sentence there, in departmental discussions of curriculum, which suggest that the old consensus on teacher training is not quite so firm as it has seemed. Two things may be happening. Obviously many people are already, and have been for some time, concerned about the academic preparation of teachers, as it is called. The question for them has been whether teachers have been given enough knowledge so as to make wise choices about what of that knowledge to transmit to students. As a result a good deal of work has been done on degree requirements, generally in the direction of increasing them and making them more specific. Now, however, it seems to be gradually being borne in on some that the relationship between collegiate and school English work implied in the old consensus may be neither necessary or logical. If not yet quite ready to question the notion of a common subject matter, they at least are beginning to look at their own subject matter more openly, trying to consider it in relation to the capacities and interests of young people, only a few of whom will become English teachers.

These changes reflect in part just a change in the composition of the Department. But there can not be much doubt that the presence of the Curriculum Center and its formal connection with the English Department has had an effect. The present and former directors are members of the English Department; between 1967 and 1970 there was a joint English-Education assistant professorship, in part supported by OE funds through the Curriculum Center. A good deal of informal and indirect (to use the best word) persuasion has been possible. For example, these circumstances have probably given the Curriculum Center newsletters somewhat more authority than even their worth might merit. In addition, it has been possible with some ease and grace to support departmental discussions of curriculum with the very important material on teaching at all levels that is coming from the Modern Language Association, through the Association of Departments of English.[1] It seems likely that this influence has been strengthened by the fact that the former director of the Center is currently a member of the Executive Committee of MLA. In regard to this connection, it may be noted that discussion is now going forward of the possibility of holding a conference on undergraduate teaching at Northwestern next fall, as a joint enterprise of MLA, the English Department, the School of Education, the Curriculum Center, and the Center for the Teaching Pro-

fessions. Necessarily this subject will require discussion of the undergraduate preparation of teachers.

Similar results can be reported for work done in connection with the School of Education. In the last five years or so, Northwestern has granted six Ph.D.'s in English Education,[2] and at the present time there are twenty-one students in various stages of work toward the degree. Up to now Center funds have been used in support of six. In addition one candidate for the Ph.D. in English has had some little support from the Center. Interestingly enough, he is now teaching a secondary school English methods course at SUNY, Stonybrook.

Students in the graduate English program and others who have been associated with the Center have joined the staff of supervisors in the MAT program, and MAT students themselves continue to use the Center resources. Except in a few cases the use has been more occasional than otherwise. But this may be a necessary consequence of the amount and kind of work that is required of MAT candidates. On the one hand, they must carry their graduate work, on the other they must teach and learn the ways of the school teacher. In addition, their apprentice role (implied in learning the ways of school teachers) conditions them to emulation not innovation, and to a debilitating acquiescence in tradition, convention, the know-how of the old hand. It is, then, perhaps little wonder that they so easily and early develop the habits of any low standing member of a hierarchical system. This effect can be prevented, or at least mitigated, however, if school administrations think of it as a problem or an undesirable outcome. And as a matter of fact, this has been the case in District 1 in Chicago, with which the Center has had a long and generally successful connection.

Work with School Districts

This report covers the work of the Center during a two year extension (1968-70) of the original funding (1962-67). Under the original funding, the Center produced (largely in the period after summer 1964) a collection of teaching materials in composition for the middle and secondary grades (seven through twelve), and these materials were presented in or to several school districts, in the fashion then thought appropriate. These materials reflected an awareness on the part of the Center staff of some of the subjects that were then

interesting college personnel engaged in "teaching writing." For example, the concepts of voice/persona and audience, the relation of style to circumstances as defined by the preceding items (=decorum in classical rhetoric), invention, a re-furbishing of the four forms of discourse in terms closer to the writing "needs" of college students, and the surface properties of certain kinds of academic writing--that is, the concision, specificity, and detailedness that have for long been sought by members of English departments, at least in the writing of freshmen.

It can now be seen that the Center materials had two distinguishing characteristics. First, they emphasized, though by no means sufficiently, the preliminaries to writing, the activities which make writing possible. Second, the materials somehow or other suggested or seemed to carry a suggestion that classroom writing should be treated as a natural activity; that is, as an activity that children--most of them--do do, because it has value for them. Or perhaps that is a phrasing that expresses what we have come to believe. At the time, it might be more accurate to say, we only felt that what children produce in the way of writing should be treated with some respect because it is theirs.

To put it simply. We assumed that children's writing would need improvement because it was not adult writing. And we produced materials to help teachers bring about that improvement. Moreover, in spite of a few words here and there that questioned the teacher as profreader, we probably assumed that paper correcting by an adult was a necessity but could be improved into copy-reading or editing. We were saved, if saved we were, because in our dim way we believed (or told ourselves we had to believe) that whatever a child writes is real to him, and that whatever is done to it must be done with respect.

To the degree that it found expression in the Center materials (and that was more in the supporting documents than in the materials themselves), this attitude was what made the materials noteworthy. It is what keeps them useful today, if materials produced extra muros are any longer useful.

We were astonished by the way teachers responded to the philosophy of the Center materials and to whatever

signs of it they found in the suggested teaching activities. On the whole most teachers--young and old, in grade school and high school, with good college backgrounds in English and with poor, from more or less established social groups and from newly assimilated ones--either rejected the lessons out of hand or at best received them with distrust. Teachers felt that insufficient attention was given to, first, the various collections of usage items by which they had come to recognize Good English and, second, the rules for the kinds of writing demanded in grades above their own. In a word, the lessons were not, in fact, really preparatory. The response was most characteristic of seventh and eighth grade teachers.[3]

This response gave us an inkling of what must be undergone in school by children without much verbal interest or capacity, those whose cultures are largely oral, and those whose dialects (in phonology, lexicon, and syntax) are difficult to represent by the forms of standard published English. It also made us realize--as those who worked on the Elementary Science Study had before us[4]--that a change in teacher attitudes must necessarily precede their ability to use new materials, if the materials are, in any degree, truly new. At the time we thought (as did ESS, it seems) that what was needed was no more than a change in teaching technique, something like a more sophisticated and respectful handling of student writing. Our notions may be summarized: if teachers would learn (be taught) more about the properties of published adult styles and the habits of adult writers and editors, their way of dealing with children writing and with the writing of children would become more concrete, and realistic, more practical; and therefore the children they were teaching would learn to be better writers. It can hardly be said, now, that we were then much in advance of the teachers who had shocked us. But who was?

The situation today is quite different, as a result of the many forces and influences that have been exerted on English in general and the Curriculum Center in particular in the past several years. A most important influence has been the result of observation of the practice of good, though not particularly advanced, primary grade teachers. Another has been simply the uneasiness that is by now pretty general among teachers, though still not often noticed by those who do not talk to teachers and only read books about them. The feeling is most obvious

among teachers in "good" schools, city and suburban, and, for easily seen reasons, among those in ghetto parochial schools. At bay--and at sea, too, perhaps--these teachers, and it is by no means only a few, nor only the young and radical or turned on, have finally begun to question not merely their techniques and means but indeed even the ends, the philosophical rationale of their work. Their questions, no doubt caused in part by romantic criticism of the schools as well as present conditions in them, have been hard ones; and they have forced a good deal of re-thinking. Finally, of course, there has been the by now comparatively vast literature on school reform. The extra-professional works in this genre have necessarily had some effect. But so far as members of the Curriculum Center staff are concerned, the decisive influence has been the work being done at the Institute of Education of the University of London, under the leadership of James N. Britton.[5]

Today the Center staff take the position that a child writing is doing something that is of value in itself, as a real activity that will and does contribute to his general development. In the first instance, the value inheres in the process itself, which must, therefore, if it is to be truly educational, go on in an environment in which there can be a strengthening of the capacities of the child--the sensuous, imaginative, and intellectual capacities of the child, the individual child--that are being realized as the child writes. Of course these capacities are being strengthened just by being used, and by reason of natural growth too. What we mean is that the natural strengthening and growth will be supported if the child-in-school is living in an environment that is composed in such a fashion that, as it is encompassed or comprehended, there will be some stretching (is that the word?) of the capacities being used. Or to put the point in somewhat more general terms, the school environment must be such as to provide opportunity for the children inhabiting it to carry on that kind of exploration by which growth in and through expression and communication may be supposed to occur.

In addition to the value in composing--and we begin to prefer that term to "writing"--there is value also in its product.[6] As mentioned earlier, members of the Center staff have always been willing to see the practical or personal value that a child's writing must have for him. In the last several years, they have also

begun to see the need for treating the writings of children as objects having intrinsic value, or the potentiality thereof. At least in pieces of free writing, generally expressive, we can now find formal characteristics that seem such as to allow it to be supposed that they provided the child who wrote them with at least some of the kind of pleasure that ensues upon successful making. Most often, perhaps, these are simple items that have little or no apparent structural relations; but with some frequency there may also be found indications of pleasure-bearing whole structures.

We are sometimes a little afraid of the consequences of statements, like the preceding, about the intrinsic value of children's writing. Like earlier suggestions about the composing and editorial processes,[7] it may support lesson plans and behavioral objectives. In this case, given present interests in "creativity,"[8] as it is called, the outcome in curriculum design might well be a series of graded lessons in creative writing for all, which would teach children how to "do" a certain number of the devices that teachers associate with literature: e.g. making metaphors.

So we repeat. What counts is the process not the product; the process and what it helps a child learn about himself and his world.

We accept that rhetoric maps the process, or part of it; and so do many textbook principles of composition. But we suspect that there may be omitted from these systems much, maybe all, that is educationally important about a child's experience with writing. Thought may be logical or not, "but logic is not a way of thinking," as Mrs. Langer has said.[9] And rhetoric and composition seem to discourage, if they do not in fact prevent, much consideration of the human situations in which valuable expression and communication arise. They also keep us from thinking very much about the conditions of creativity, such things as the ways of providing some kind of psychological safety for children who are being required to enter upon the task, so patently dangerous to most of them, of extending their selves into a written product; and that by an adult who is an impersonal authority-figure. Or to put the matter another way, can the principles of rhetoric and composition tell us anything at all of the steps we might take to assure children of the freedoms necessary to achieving the formal and con-

ventional, as they are found in the properties of composed pieces? And where, we ask, in a classroom oriented toward training for future role-performance, where in such a classroom is a child to be able even to find, let alone open himself to, a fructifying range of experiences, where in such a classroom will a child find the time to toy with, try out his own ideas, notions, and dreams, where in such a classroom will a child have a chance to learn to trust himself as judge of his own work? Perhaps above all, in such a classroom, when will a child be able to use his language for his own purposes?

Perhaps the point will be clarified by the following teaching protocol developed at the Center.[10]

John is a handsome nine-year-old truant, a ward of the court who is attending Chicago Parental School. When he entered the school, he was given the usual battery of tests. On the Gates reading test he hadn't scored at all, his IQ score had been 69. And in the succeeding six weeks his record had been unencouraging, especially in reading, that most central of school activities. Now the principal has decided to try talk. [However he understood it, the principal's decision represents an acceptance of the boy's culture.]

John is in a counsellor's office, along with two other boys and a member of the Curriculum Center staff, who is trying to make some kind of contact with him. She tries several openings but is always met "with the downward-cast eyes, the 'yes, ma'ams' and'no, ma'ams' with which a child builds his impenetrable fortress against adults who bombard him with talk." [Talk is not enough, and teacher-talk may be self-defeating, counter-productive, since it is all too likely to be directed toward the school's ends rather than the child's interests and concerns, or treats the latter somewhat abstractly and generally, as evidence or confirmation of typicality rather than as foundation of individuality.]

But the staff member keeps on and finally asks, "John, if you could be anywhere in the world right now, doing anything you wanted, what would you choose?" [The question touches the particular moment and the feelings it contains, which should be obvious. It also involves the imagination. And it may have led the child to feel some real interest on the part of his interlocutor, to which he could respond on his own part with interest in

the other. But of course one can't be sure of that, since the effect would depend as much on the tone of the utterance as on its words, and we don't have the tone. Yet, evidently, the question created some kind of contact, for it did elicit a reply.]

"For the first time those great brown eyes looked up, and he said, 'I'd be home. And I'd be cooking chicken for my mother.' Then the brown eyes dropped again." [The expression of need is obvious: not only the desire to be home, but also the need to handle the desire.]

"Why, John, can you cook chicken?" was the response. "All by yourself?" [Probably unpremeditated, but no doubt all the more productive for that, the questions give value to the boy and a thing he can do. The effect is strengthened by what followed.]

"Sure can," John replies. "Ain't nothin' to that." [Building on the adult response, confirming its implied valuation.]

The staff member tells him not many boys nine years old can cook chicken. She asks the other boys if they can. They say they can't, and John is surprised. [The social situation is realized, and John is given a reason for "communicating" and an audience that is quite close to a natural one.]

Here is the outcome:

> First you go to the supermart and you get you a chicken. Look for a cutup one on the meat counter--then you don't have to cut it into pieces yourself--that's messy. Then you take it home and wash it in the sink and let it set a while so all the water runs off. Then you get a brown bag and you put you a scoop of flour in it and some salt. Then you get you a skillet and you put you some lard in it, a couple of big spoons. Then you turn the stove on--low. Then you take the biggest piece of chicken and dump it in the bag and hold the top tight. And shake it like this. Then you take it out and put in the next piece. Do all the pieces. And you got to go fast because you keep looking at that old fat in the pan and when it starts singing around the edges and the bubbles start dancing, you got to put the chicken in, or you're in trouble. That's all there is to it.

You turn the chicken with a big long fork when it look just right. And you cook the other side.

Later, prompted by a question from one of the boys, John explained the making of french fried potatoes.

Programs

In 1968-70 the Center's work was concentrated on in-service training programs, with (1) the schools associated with the Elk Grove Training and Development Center, (2) the Center for Urban Education of the Archdiocesan school systems, (3) District 214 in the general area of Arlington Heights, northwest of Chicago, and (4) District 1 in Chicago.

1. Elk Grove Training and Development Center. This program was begun in 1967-68 with Symposium I, so-called, in which about seventy teachers met once every two weeks for discussions that were led by the members of the Center staff. The topics were the changing shape of "English" and the various sorts of new teaching materials that had been developed up to that time.

In 1968-69 (the first year of the current funding) the program of Symposium I was continued, with of course a new group of teachers and, it seems likely, a somewhat more refined awareness of developments in English. The teachers from the 1967-68 group continued their discussion and speculation in Symposium II; in addition they were engaged in planning in-service activities of their own for 1969-70.

During 1968-69 four teachers from the Elk Grove schools had half-time study appointments at the Center. Their work was supported jointly by the Center, the Elk Grove Training and Development Center, and their school districts.

These programs of course affected the teachers who came; and given the number of participants (on the order of 150), it is hard to believe that some effect was not felt in the schools. At least the Center must have become known: when the English departments in the high school district (214. There are seven or eight schools; it is the largest high school district in the state, out-

side Chicago.), under some pressure from the curriculum supervisor, began to meet to discuss their course offerings (sic), the co-operation of the Center was sought. But as to long term gains in the schools, long term change from which children will benefit--about such matters, it is hard to express anything but dubiety. The reasons for the doubt will be suggested later.

2. The Center for Urban Education. This program continued through 1968-70, following the format of the Elk Grove Symposium. Participants (to the number of 150) came from about forty ghetto or fringe area schools. In 1968-69 two teachers from the archdiocesan system held study appointments at the Center, again on joint support by the Center and their schools.

As an outgrowth of this program, in 1969 the Center, Holy Family Community Center, and the Illinois Program for the Gifted supported a four week summer school (pre-school through eighth grade) for about 225 children. The staff consisted of six participants from Center released time programs and fifteen teachers from city public and parochial schools. The school ran in the mornings; afternoons the staff met for planning, assessment, and other comparable activities. For one week at the beginning and another at the end, the staff met for discussion of basic issues, study of materials, in-service planning for 1969-70, and introspection.

Since 1969 the Center has had a fairly close connection with several West Side parochial schools. Extensive use has been made of the Center's resources in material and personnel, and in the summer of 1970 Center funds (Title XI) helped support a very interesting workshop for teachers and parents. University credit was received for the work. Since this work has gone on outside the period covered by this report and has been supported by other funds, it is mentioned here only to suggest the importance that the Center has come to have to those teachers in Chicago and the surrounding area who are feeling need for change.

3. District 214. The Center was originally consulted when the English Department at Prospect High School decided to introduce a modified Apex curriculum. In retrospect it seems clear enough that the intention probably was to find some authority for the changes. Discussions first included representatives from the various high schools; composition of the group differed

from meeting to meeting. Eventually, as the large groups became less and less stable, a core of teachers interested in exploration and speculation, some of whom had participated in the Elk Grove Symposiums, decided to come together on their own to pursue the questions of concern to them.

At the present time the Center is working only with the English Department in Arlington High School. It should be mentioned that the monthly meetings in this program have been attended pretty consistently by the principal, the department chairman, and the district curriculum supervisor.

4. District 1 (Chicago). In September 1968 the District Superintendent asked the Center staff to co-operate in a program of monthly in-service whrkshops. The program is continuing today. The format is especially interesting. The workshop participants include the principal and one teacher from each school in the district. The principals, that is, have been coming for three years (allowing for normal retirements and transfers); three different groups of teachers have participated. The meetings occur on a Friday morning (8:30-11:30); on school time, that is.

Subjects for discussion at the workshop meetings have covered a wide range. Dorothy Heathcote has lectured on improvised drama; this year she also demonstrated her methods for teachers in the district. Children's writing has been discussed several times. There now seems to have been a rather special significance to one such session, in which the subject was a small collection of books composed and illustrated by primary grade children, and the material useful to teachers that can be extracted from such works. One had the feeling that the demonstration opened many "freeing" thoughts to the teachers.

In two other very successful meetings, participants engaged themselves in creative work: first, in response to a showing of the short film "A Dream of Wild Horses," after which participants wrote, drew, or talked; second, after hearing a list of words that seemed likely to have heavy value charges for teachers, the participants composed very brief personal responses. Neither of these devices was presented as illustrating anything new in the way of a teaching technique or a "motivational" device, though perhaps to some they may have seemed to be

intended so. The whole and only intention was simply to set up a situation in which the participants could and would experience creative activity with some detachment.

At other meetings participants have discussed such subjects as uses of small group discussion, methods of classroom questioning, the place of literary works in English, talk as a medium of learning, and the design of the English classroom. They have heard teachers from other systems, including Geoffrey Summerfield, of York (England), describe their experiences with new materials and techniques. They have watched and discussed television tapes of teachers in action that have been made at the Center. Above all, because of the generally informal structure of the meetings, the participants have had plenty of opportunity to talk among themselves and with the various members of the Center staff who have attended the meetings.

For all the years that these meetings have been going on, there have been teachers from District 1 who have had part-time study assignments at the Center. These teachers have become important resource persons in the schools of the district, especially in the last year or so, since a bi-weekly in-service session has been made a regular activity in the city system. There can be little doubt that these meetings have been more useful in District 1--indeed have had a better shape there--partly because of the principals' experience in the program assisted by the Center and partly also because of the fairly sizable cadre of teachers with experiences either of the program or of work at the Center.

Selected List of In-Service Work or New English Activities in District 1

Bateman School	Literature as a way of making all subjects more interesting and relevant to life as it is lived.
Cleveland School	Using music as a way of motivating children, grades 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 represented.
Farnsworth School	Composition in the middle grades. School visits, Northwestern materials.
Garvy School	Innovative approaches at all levels. Creative writing, role playing, the journal, improvisation, new approaches to literature, multimedia.
Henry School	Increasing creativity in composition through art, music, dramatics, role playing, public speaking, parodying, journal editing, patterning after classics, TV commercials, etc. Middle and upper grades
Hibbard School	Study of small independent group work in the process of composing.
Oriole School	Establishing objectives for the teaching of English. Pilot program on the classroom newspaper.
Peterson School	Approaches to motivation through creative expression. Mass media, non-verbal art forms, reporting, anecdotes, stories, mysteries, newspapers, journals, etc.
Solomon School	Composition in the Middle Grades. Creating new materials, using Northwestern materials. Beginning with assessment of children's practical and creative writings.
Volta School	Basic issues, creative writing, new approaches: class librarian, newspapers, tape recordings, etc. Discussion of samples of children's writing.

Wildwood School	Co-operative program with Jenner School. Stories, poems, and compositions are taped at Wildwood and sent to Jenner for purposes of motivating students at both schools.

Mention should also be made of the Solomon School non-graded elementary program.

The Solomon Non-Graded Program is not only unique for District 1 but also for the entire city. Solomon is one of the first Chicago elementary schools to implement the non-graded approach to learning. The program resulted from the co-operation of the administration and staff of Solomon, the Northwestern University Curriculum Center staff, and the community leaders and organizations.

Under the leadership of Mrs. Elizabeth LaPalermo, planning for the new program started in June, 1969. The academic year 1969-70 was devoted to outlining structure, designing new curriculum guidelines, visiting working models of similar programs, intensive readings, reviewing materials, consulting University experts, and many in-service meetings.

The program became operational in 1970-71.

PRIMARY (first and second grades). This unit is composed of a total of sixty students in two self-contained classrooms taught by two instructors who employ team teaching techniques.

INTERMEDIATE (third, fourth, and fifth grades). The intermediate section is departmentalized in the mornings to cover the curriculums of Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science. The intermediate program is "graded" in the afternoon according to psychomotor abilities for instruction in Gym, Penmanship, Music, and Art.

UPPER UNIT (sixth, seventh and eighth grades). The top unit is organized on several levels. The Language Arts and Mathematics classes are grouped according to ability level and maturity. The Science and Social Studies classes are organized on a cycling basis so that seventh & eighth grade pupils will not re-study previously taught material. The Resource Center is for group projects.

Finally, there is the Curriculum Center Annex, which has been developed at Von Steuben High School and Upper Grade Center. The nature and effect of the Annex may be gathered from this sample periodic report, which covers a period in February and March 1970. It was written by the member of the Center staff who has been primarily responsible for the Annex.

*****

We've now had four seminars in children's literature and it's time for me to record our experiences. If you have a few minutes for reading this, that's fine. It's a record for me; one that might be helpful when we think about planning future programs; it contains nothing that needs immediate attention.

Six teachers have been coming to the literature seminar in addition to Thetis Karpek and me. It's a nice number, we're beginning to know each other very well. Grades 1-8 are represented.

At our first session a teacher from Hibbard shared some writing her children had done in response to a paper-back book that many had read and discussed. This was good, it set a tone for future meetings. We talked over questions of little things--how to keep records of what children are reading, kinds of questions that are helpful in talking about what you've read, etc. We agreed on a common reading for the second session, My Side of the Mountain, suggested by Thetis. This was an interesting book to choose--it happens to be one that children will very seldom read by themselves without some kind of introduction. It is a first-person narrative and has a flashback.

At the second session Thetis talked with the discussion group (collecting open-ended questions) while I talked with two primary teachers who wanted to talk about early reading. During the second half I helped teachers with book-binding, then settled down with two teachers to talk over the possibility (or impossibility) of a common book report form for any kind of book that children might read. It was interesting to find that the teacher who was asking the questions accepted the experience of a Hibbard teacher far more readily than she would accept mine. Fortunately, the Hibbard teacher was talking my line.

At the third session we started talking about our experiences in school (I had an ulterior motive: I was gathering data for a paper). We came to grips with the futility of learning as preparation and reflected that this might apply to children in our classes, too. We had a good talk. After about forty minutes I began getting nervous because we weren't talking about the topic (children's literature) that we were supposed to talk about. They didn't want to stop talking about themselves. Finally I just confessed my pedagogical compulsions and insisted we get to the literature (you see, I had a lesson planned). We acknowledged the value of sharing personal experiences as part of learning and moved on to our "lesson." It consisted of my first sharing with them techniques of presenting poetry or short prose selections with the overhead, children's work as well as the work of published authors. They were quite interested and rather shocked at the initial messy-looking papers as compared with finished products. A few eyebrows were raised because my children didn't have margins, etc. I think they all had the good feeling that their children did neater work than my children did, and they went off in good spirits.

At the fourth session we shared reactions to our common reading, and one of the members talked about a book (Harriet the Spy) that had evoked memories of her own childhood. We compared an adventure story (Snow Treasure) with stories that have significant character development (And Now, Miguel; Harriet the Spy; Call It Courage; Durango Street). We are now and then getting a touch of the excitement that comes when we catch a glimpse of an author's vision, sensing what it might be, and responding with feeling.

I think that all the teachers (including the 8th grade teacher) are sharing good books that they're currently reading with their children. All of them are reading aloud to their children. When we've talked about a book or a poem, I haven't forced any insights; I think that I've been trying to establish a comfortable group that can talk easily and appreciate and enjoy each other's ideas and experiences.

As teachers have talked about the children in their rooms, and the kinds of responses children are making, I've recommended specific novels, short stories, and poems. This is the kind of response David Holbrook

recommends (The Exploring Word). It's exciting for me to be doing this with teachers because I think that implicitly a message is getting across: when we know and enjoy literature for children we can respond not just with our own (paltry) resources, but with a lot of good stuff that authors have written.

At the fourth session teachers requested that we show a few films next time. When we talked about a reading for the next session, the interests were so varied that we decided to read whatever we chose and to share whatever we think the others might like to hear about. Many books have been checked out at the end of each session. The progression from shared readings to individual choices follows ordinary classroom patterns in reading if teachers let it happen.

I think our goal in this seminar is to help teachers enjoy the books that our children might enjoy (even a few others!). The means and ends are unitary (good Dewey). We're enjoying this so well that a slight twinge of guilt creeps in now and then--if it's so much fun, can it really be learning?

The professional conversation that is occurring is good. Within schools many teachers resist sharing with each other. In a faculty meeting, the question: What's she bucking for? seems to be thought, though not spoken, when a colleague shares information. The need for sharing experiences and reflecting on them, for sharing techniques and resources, for open doors and cooperative teaching, is apparent. Incidentally, Mrs. Krause of Hibbard has written up a well-thought-out lesson plan that probably can be included in our next newsletter. She was pleased and conscientious about writing it up when I said others might benefit from her experience.

The Wednesday morning open house isn't bulging with visitors, but there were two parent aides (we talked about reading books to children and taking dictation from children) on the first Wednesday, a book binder on the third Wednesday, and a third-grade teacher full of questions and enthusiasm on the fourth Wednesday (poetry, dramatic improvisation, children's writing and children's literature, art activities). Since the

visitors have no competition for attention, poor souls have had a terribly concentrated learning experience with me.

The members of the English department at Von Steuben are enjoying the Wednesday films. They begin coming in at 10:20, continue through the lunch periods and during the last period of the afternoon. Julie is selecting fine films, getting announcements into the faculty bulletin each week to let teachers know what's being shown.

Annette's drama group has met just twice. I talked with her after their first meeting. She had some questions about how long she could "feed into" this group. We have agreed that this group will meet until spring vacation on Tuesday afternoons instead of Monday. Annette, because she is just beginning to work dramatically with her own classes, feels a little uncomfortable in her role with this group. Rita and I are going to try to drop in occasionally on Tuesdays.

This past Wednesday three parents came in from Ebinger to learn how to take dictation. After they had been with me for half an hour, two parents from Solomon arrived with arms full of children's paintings with dictated stories attached. They wanted help with binding the works. The Solomon parents proceeded to tell the Ebinger parents just what they had done, how they helped the children, worked with teachers, etc. The Ebinger mothers were thrilled with this help.

Then it was film-showing time and the five talky women had to quiet down, so we moved our table out into the hallway and worked at binding and talking out there. High School students looked at this strange sight. But it was successful--the film viewers had quiet and we had space for work. After working there for forty-five minutes, we carried our table back in and had a cup of coffee. The Solomon ladies are coming back next week to finish their project.

*****

It is a curious but by no means irrelevant fact that, in a statement written in the spring of 1969, some doubt was expressed about the effect of the monthly meetings in District 1, and the worth of continuing them. No such feeling exists today. The whole program with District 1 has been very successful, and it now seems that the monthly meetings did a good deal in the way of preparing the way for the kind of independent work that teachers in District 1 seem to be doing.

In many ways the Center's work with teachers and administrators in District 1 seems to offer a useful model for university-school cooperation in a program of continuing education for teachers. The following characteristics of the program may be noted as worth attending to, perhaps even duplicating, in planning.

1. Continuity. There has been time in the monthly meetings for district participants to get used to the workers from the University, and for the latter to establish friendly relations with a number of participants. There has been time also for teachers to learn in a natural fashion. The continued presence of the principals through three years of monthly meetings has had a visible effect on many of them. It should be noted that some of the same effect has probably been achieved, so far as teachers are concerned, simply by the connections possible among members of the three groups of participants.

2. Personnel. The fact that the monthly meetings engage both principals and teachers is an important one. So is the fact that the District Superintendent comes to all meetings. Putting it crudely, the effect is to give the meetings and other activities an official imprimatur, which must have been strengthened by the fact that the meetings occurred during the school day.

But there is another more subtle and by far more important effect. The joining of teachers and administrators in common work may be supposed to have done at least a little to break down the dreadful depersonalization and de-professionalization of teachers which are so characteristic an element in American school life.

3. Auxiliaries. It seems likely that the program in District 1 was considerably strengthened by the

existence of the Curriculum Center Annex and also by the presence in the schools of teachers who had been on released time assignment at the Center. The effect of both was to strengthen even further the sense that the program is (relatively) permanent, that it is a co-operative venture, that the ideas and philosophy of the program are, as it were, a part of the living scene, a real part of the working life of all the teachers.

It is obvious, but nevertheless may need to be noted, that these three sets of characteristics all bear on the structure of the program rather than on what it may be said to have brought to the teachers in the way of new techniques and materials. We want to suggest that that is precisely the point: that the essential reason for the successes that have been achieved in District 1 is the structure and spirit of the program; that and, of course, the kind of occurrence that is regarded as a success.

By now the object (objective) of the Center's programs must be clear. It is to help teachers develop a feeling about themselves in their roles that will support them in becoming truly and usefully self-conscious about their performance. They must understand enough so as to be able to choose intelligently among the courses of action open to them as they seek to help with learning. Discussion of materials is an important means to this end. But the power for change is more in the nature and form of the discussion than it is in its subject. That is the reason we so emphasize the structure of the District 1 program.

An example of the effect that we have sought may be seen in the following incident, which occurred just the other day during a meeting of the current group of released-time teachers. They had been discussion of some student writing, including a particular paper (illustration A, Appendix). Throughout, the conversation had been about the content of the papers, what the children were saying--not what they were <u>trying</u> to say, what they <u>were</u> saying. The other papers were no "better" than the one reproduced, by the way. Even so, in every case what the teachers responded to was the human communication.

That in itself suggests something of the kind and amount of change that is occurring in some teachers in District 1. But there is even more significance in

the final remark of the teacher in whose class the papers had been written. She is a woman of considerable intelligence, culture, and academic training. A Phi Beta Kappa from a major university, she has had experience as a social worker and counsellor. Part of her obviously felt comfortable with being able to respond to the papers in the way that has been suggested. But another part was troubled by the new kind of teaching problem she was having to face. Finally she phrased the problem.

"You know," she said, "it's hard, what we have to do now. I used to be able to put together units and then go through them in a neat way, orderly. I knew what I was doing. Now I know what I ought to do, but I'm not sure I know enough to do it. I ought to be able to suggest something for that boy to read. Something that would be connected with the feelings, the things he says in the paper. But I don't know any books to suggest."

That, it seems to us, is the attitude, the sense of the job that is needed. To help to set some beginnings for achieving it has been the purpose of the Center. And the program with District 1 is, we think, a well designed means to that end.

RESULTS

Under the present contract the job of the Curriculum Center has been three-fold: first, to be a resource and materials center for teachers in the Chicago area; second, to carry on programs of further education for teachers, when asked, and to try to develop specifications for such programs; third, to become established as a (more or less) continuing office of the university.

Of these jobs only one needs any further detailing at this point; that is the one concerned with developing specifications for programs in continuing education for teachers. It may be useful to set these forth in brief--for propaedeutic and heuristic purposes, as it were.

1. In the current situation, programs of continuing education must have three purposes:

(a) to correct some of the vast amount of mis- and non-information about language and literature with which teachers have filled in the gaps left by their education,

(b) to bring teachers into contact with and to involve them in the discussion of the concept "English,"

(c) to strengthen and support the sense of special role in teachers.

2. The means to these ends will vary somewhat according to special conditions in different districts or schools, but, broadly speaking, any program should have the following characteristics:

(a) complete administrative support, made visible by participation,

(b) a basis in co-operative discussion,

(c) meetings on school time,

(d) opportunity for small group work at the university,

(e) continuity: the program should seem to become a routine part of school work,

(f) development of teachers as leaders for in-service education, at least of an informal sort.

This report, it is hoped, will indicate some of the details by which such more or less hypothetical notions have been realized; or to put it the other way around,

the details in the report may suggest how these hypothetical conclusions were arrived at.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this report is simple enough, though it is not easy to state in any summary fashion. Still, perhaps an attempt can be made.

The value of the Center lies in what can be learned from its history. That history will show how a university office grew to have an organic connection to a major segment of the school community of Chicago. (To mention but one of the Center programs, 24,800 children attend the public schools in District 1.) Studied, that history will yield general principles, applicable to most if not all comparable situations. For the success of the Center has not been a result of personal style, unless it may be said to have been personal style which led the Center staff to believe that the ending end of all its work must be to build the conditions for true and equal conversation, talk, among the participants in the joint enterprise. As has been said again and again in these papers, this approach overturns the conventional notion of teacher-training and, indeed, the very notion of the teacher. But perhaps that is one other thing that needs to be done. As Abraham Maslow says,

> Ultimately the person, even the child, must choose for himself. Nobody can choose for him too often, for this itself enfeebles him, cutting his self-trust, and confusing his <u>ability</u> to perceive his own internal delight in the experience, his own impulses, judgments, and feelings, and to differentiate them from the interiorized standards of others.

REFERENCES
Introduction

1. Thomas Vogt, "The First Level of Incompetence: Intellectualism," in Thomas Vogt, ed., Five Levels of Incompetence, the Report of the Grove Park Institute [Washington:] Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs, 1970, p. 13.

2. The Grove Park Institute met June 10-15, 1969, to discuss the role of the disciplines and the professional societies in the education of teachers. As a matter of fact, much of the discussion turned on the amounts of the child's day that ought to be apportioned to the various disciplines.

3. Paul A. Olson, "Humanism, Society, and the Education of Teachers," in Vogt, Five Levels, pp. 123-41, at p. 123.

4. Vogt, Five Levels, Foreword, p. xix.

5. Saul B. Cohen, "A Challenge and Call to the Disciplines," in Vogt, Five Levels, pp. 5-10, at p. 5.

6. Ibid., p. 9.

7. Vogt, Five Levels, Foreword, p. xix.

8. John B. Davis, Jr., "Remarks at the Grove Park Institute," in Vogt, Five Levels, pp. 89.

9. Ibid.

10. Vernon Haubrich, "We Already Have Our Hats," in Vogt, Five Levels, pp. 103-16, at p. 103.

11. Vogt, "The Second Level of Incompetence: Inanition Before Complexity," in Vogt, Five Levels, p. 35.

12. "Change in English" (the final report of the English Group at Grove Park), in Vogt, Five Levels, pp. 261-65, at p. 262. The report was signed by, among others, the President and Executive Secretary of NCTE, and an Associate Executive Secretary of MLA.

13. "Gull Lake Report on the Relationship of School and College Departments of English," Michigan State University Conference in English, November 6-8, 1969. Typescript, [p. 1].

14. The point that this is a radical reconsideration needs to be made because of various inadequate views of the drift of discussion at the Dartmouth Conference (1966). Cf. Wayne O'Neill, Harvard Educational Review, XXXIX (1969), 359-65; Charles A. Nevi, "Growth Through English: Another Appraisal," English Journal, LIX (1969.) 912-19; James E. Miller, Harvard Educational Review, XL, (1970), 642-50.

For Paul Olson's comment see his speech at Grove Park, referred to above, Note 3.

15. James E. Miller, "Imagination and the Health of Everyman," Typescript, pp. [1]-15, at p. 13.

16. On the English teacher's responsibility for communication and imagination, see James Hoetker and William P. Ahlbrand, Jr., The Persistence of the Recitation (St. Ann, Missouri: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, [n.d.] , reviewing the literature "describing instructional practices." Though the studies in general seem not to have distinguished among teachers by subjects, there is probably no reason to suppose that English teacher behavior is much different from that reported for teachers in general. Hoetker and Ahlbrand's concluding questions are poignant:

> The studies that have been reviewed show a remarkable stability of classroom verbal behavior patterns over the last half century, despite the fact that each successive generation of educational thinkers, no matter how else they differed, has condemned the rapid-fire, question-answer pattern of instruction. This opens a number of interesting avenues of inquiry. What is there about the recitation, for instance, that makes it so singularly successful in the evolutionary struggle with other, more highly recommended, methods? That is, what survival needs of teachers are met uniquely by the recitation?
>
> Then there is the question of what seems to be the monumental inefficacy of teacher training institutions in affecting the classroom behavior of teachers. If the recitation is a poor pedagogical method, as most teacher educators long have believed, why have they not been able to deter teachers from using it?
>
> Or is it not possible that the practicing teachers are right, and the professors unrealistic, and that the recitation--for some reason--is the best pedagogical method? Or the only practicable one for most teachers?
>
> (page 19, emphasis added)

17. Gull Lake Report, p.[1].

18. Ed Fenton, Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools (New York, 1966), p. 2. See also W.W.Douglas, "Power and Responsibility: English Departments and the Preparation of Teachers," a speech delivered at the Midwest Modern Language Association, 19 October 1968 and printed in ADE Bulletin, No. 20, January 1969, pp. 3-15.

REFERENCES
Methods

1. Note especially the September 1969 issue of ADE Bulletin, with articles by Caroline Shrodes, Chairman of the English Department, San Francisco State College (pp. 4-11), John Fisher, Executive Secretary of MLA (pp. 17-20), and Alan Hollingsworth, Chairman of the English Department, Michigan State University (pp. 39-46).
"Language, Literature, and Responsible Human Being: A New Approach to the Humanities," a proposal by MLA and NCTE to the National Endowment for the Humanities, is of considerable interest, as suggesting the conception of "English" that is taking shape among at least some influential members of the profession.

2. They are presently teaching at Michigan State, Rutgers, Indiana, Southern Illinois, and the Chicago Circle Campus of the University of Illinois; the sixth has remained in his school system.

3. The points made in this paragraph are "impressionistic," the result of observation and talk, not of the examination of the sort of hard data that are gathered by questionnaires or opinionnaires.

4. "Not Yet A Reform," Elementary Science Study Newsletter, No. 16, October 1968, pp. 1-2. See also W.S. Learned and W.C.Bagley, et.al., The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 14, 1920), p. 8.

5. Mr. Britton is now professor in Goldsmith's College of the University of London. See his Language and Learning, London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1970.

6. See W.W.Douglas, "On Value in Children's Writing,"

in Stephen A. Dunning, ed., English for the Junior High Years (Champaign: NCTE, 1969), pp. 63-78.

7. Cf. idem, "Composition and the Editorial Process," in Gary Tate, ed., Reflections on High School English (Tulsa: University of Tulsa, 1966), pp. 76-90.

8. Cf. John Dixon in the preface to the second edition of Growth Through English (1969), where he somehow gives the impression that notions of creativity were the most (if not the sole) important contribution from the Dartmouth Conference.

9. Suzanne Langer, Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling (Two volumes: Baltimore, 1967), I, 149.

10. By Mrs. Rita Hansen, Clinical Assistant Professor at Northwestern and a teacher at Taft High School, Chicago.

APPENDIX

Illustration A

Jack Taylor?

In 8th grade I had a tacher that I like he was brave. He came to a all black school and he was white. He was nice if it had not been for him I would not have pass the 8 grade constitution test but we work hard and he help me.

Per. 1
1) 19) 71

He invited me and misty out to his house alone with two girls we went it was in eavsten. We ate dinner listen to record and took pictrec.

Lator that year I as the zodeaic, misty, big red, bug eye, welf man, and the wall made him a honey Soul Brother.

Right now this very day you could not say anyone to mass with him. "Mr Oates".

Zodeaic

a

RESOURCE MATERIALS

Videotapes

Twenty tapes of classroom teaching and talks on teaching of English. The catalog is attached

Four tapes of lectures on improvisation in the classroom by Dorothy Heathcote, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; produced in cooperation with the Chicago Board of Education and the International Steering Committee of MLA-NCTE.

Checklists and Handlists

1. Afro-American literature
2. Poetry paperbacks
3. English elementary school
4. Current books of interest to English teachers (4 lists; annotations)
5. Short films for English teachers

Teaching Support Materials

1. Notes for teachers: a collection of fugitive pieces, by teachers, on such subjects as new classroom activities, classroom management and design for creativity, creative thinking, book binding, etc.
2. Documents related to changes in English curruculum at Evanston Township High School.
3. A collection of papers, prepared by teachers, related to problems of advanced composition classes.
4. File of clippings on current practices in schools (about 100 different items).
5. "Approaches to English"--a collection of 25 lessons or units developed during the Elk Grove Symposium.
6. The beginnings of a collection of creative writing by teachers; contains, e.g. "District 1 Teachers and Principals Speak."
7. A file of "readings" (poetry and prose) useful as enrichment materials for English. For reference only, since most of material is in copyright.
8. A file of children's writing, some with annotations.

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF VIDEOTAPES
PREPARED BY THE PROJECT

The videotapes produced by the project will be made available to interested educators through the Northwestern University English Curriculum Study and Dissemination Center, 1809 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Illinois, 60201.

CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATIONS

1. STUDENTS AS BOOKMAKERS
   Mrs. Priscilla Avery
   Sunset Ridge School, Northfield, Grade 4

Tape shows students engaged in various stages of writing books for use in the primary grades of the same school. Includes such things as research discussion among joint authors, illustrations, writing, preparation of copy, and binding. Commentary by the teacher explaining the activities and interviews of students commenting on their writing projects.

2. SELF-DIRECTION IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS
   Sister Rosaleen Dorn
   St. James School, Chicago, Grade 8

Shots of students in a free activity language arts class. Students are variously engaged in preparing and presenting dramas, reading, mask making, puppet making, tape recording stories, and listening to stories. Interviews with students. Commentary by Sister Rosaleen describing the problems and pleasures of a loosely structured language arts class. Compare with tape #8, "Indians" and tape #9, "The Free Time," which show similar approaches with younger children.

3. IMPROVISATIONS
   Mrs. Vernal Doyle
   Arlington High School, Arlington Heights, Grade 9

Students improvise confrontations between characters from a number of one-act plays studied by the class. Tape includes class preparations, small group discussions, and actual performances. Interview with students. Commentary by Mrs. Doyle on the problems of introducing dramatic activity in high school English classes. Class illustrates the problems described by the teacher, as students seemed somewhat self-conscious, and involvement was not especially high. Compare with junior high dramatic activity in tape #10, "The Music of People," and kindergartens in #7, "Angus and the Ducks."

4. APPROACHES TO REMEDIAL READING
Mrs. Linda Fischer
Howard Junior High School, Wilmette, Grades 7-8

Survey of a class in remedial reading for seventh and eighth grades showing various devices, machines, materials and methods that can be used on an individual basis in self-directed student activities. Commentary by Mrs. Fischer explaining what the students are doing and reasons for individual activities in her program, as well as comments on individual students and their behavior during the class session.

5. THE SKATING RINK
Mrs. Barbara Gallagher
Edison Park School, Chicago, Middle Grades

Students examine a condensed version of Maureen Daly's "The Skating Rink" and suggest ways of adding visual detail. Reading of several compositions. Interviews with students. In the commentary Mrs. Gallagher describes other techniques she uses in teaching writing to middle grade students. Discusses advantages. Compare with tape #6, "The Third Thing," which shows another group of middle grade students writing.

6. THE THIRD THING
Miss Joy Hebert
District 65 Laboratory School, Evanston, Middle Grades

Class showing students engaged in a discussion of short passages from children's literature and writing about personal experiences. Commentary by Miss Hebert describes several students in the class and shows the range of writing and reading activities under way in the class. Useful for discussion of the teacher's role in the writing process and as an illustration of the teacher as a resource person. See also lecture tape #16, "Language Experience in the Elementary School," by Miss Hebert.

7. ANGUS AND THE DUCKS
Miss Julia Hohulin
The Dwyer School, Arlington Heights, Kindergarten

Children listen to a reading of Marjorie Flack's "Angus and the Ducks," and after sufficient discussion and meditation, dramatize the story in groups of three and four. Commentary by Miss Hohulin describes approaches to creative dramatics for kindergartners and suggests a variety of ways in which the teacher can encourage children to engage in dramatics and story-telling. Compare with tapes #s 3, 10, and 13.

8. INDIANS--A SOMEWHAT THEMATIC UNIT
Miss Julia Hohulin
The Dwyer School, Arlington Heights, Kindergarten

Shot during November, the tape shows kindergartners in a free activity class preparing for an extravangaza on Indians. Children are variously involved in painting teepees, sawing wood for a bonfire, preparing Indian costumes, listening to tape recorded stories, constructing ears of corn out of kernels and toilet paper tubes, and listening to music that bears no relation to the project. Tape presents a strong argument for the value of "talk" in the classroom. Provides an interesting example of a teacher's skillful rewarding of student efforts. Miss Hohulin displays great enthusiasm and interest.

9. THE FREE TIME
Sister Mary Hedwig Kuczymnski
St. Casimir School, Chicago, Grade 1

The tape consists of shots during a one hour session with a first grade class during a period the teacher called "The Free Time" part of the day. Most of the children are of Spanish and Puerto Rican backgrounds, and the period provides them with an opportunity to use English in real situations.

10. THE MUSIC OF PEOPLE
Sister Ann Liedel
St. Lawrence School, Chicago, Grade 7

In the culmination of a literature and composition unit on "People," the students prepare and present dances and pantomimes to accompany popular music which discusses human relations. Groups work on projects independently, using records, poems, and stories for their presentations.

11. PUPPETS AND POETRY
Mrs. Jean Nowack
Greenbriar School, Arlington Heights, Grade 2

Students present plays with potato puppets, and in the second half of the tape, read and discuss some of their own poems about holidays and field trips. Illustrates how puppets can shift focus of attention away from the child and allow him greater freedom of expression. Poetry readings suggest the children's eagerness to write. Compare with #12, "The Television Review."

12. THE TELEVISION REVIEW
Mrs. Margaret Petroff
Round Lake Elementary School, Round Lake, Grade 8

Writing and presentation of a television program reviewing short pieces of poetry written by students in the class. Includes sundry interruptions for commercials produced in a creative writing session.

13. OUR TOWN
Mr. Lou Roubidoux
South Junior High School, Arlington Heights, Grade 8

Tape shows the culminating activities of a unit on drama. One group discusses background material for "Our Town" and dramatizes one scene. Excerpts from presentations by other groups. Interesting comparisons with creative dramatics tapes, numbers 2, 3, 7, and 10.

LECTURE-DISCUSSION TAPES

14. VALUES IN READING AND LITERATURE
Wallace Douglas
Northwestern University

Two reels. The speaker discusses traditional teaching values in relation to "our literary heritage" and suggests perspectives on the teaching of reading, literature, and writing in elementary and secondary schools. Also indicates that teacher techniques, such as extensive revisions of student writing, often extract all vitality and freedom of expression from written reports and interpretations. See also #15, "Literature and the Individual" and #23, "Involving Students with Literature."

15. LITERATURE AND THE INDIVIDUAL
Michael Flanigan
Northwestern University

The speaker evaluates traditional approaches to the teaching of literature, analyzes recent trends in the area, and suggests ways in which reading can be made pleasurable and profitable for students on an individual basis. Describes recent school textbooks which offer fresh approaches and attitudes. Can be used in conjunction with #23, "Involving Students with Literature."

16. LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Miss Joy Hebert
Northwestern University

Miss Hebert discusses the "language experience" approach to reading and writing and illustrates its results with three children who were her students at the District 65 Laboratory School, Evanston. Suggests the need for asking students about their concerns before providing specific activities. Urges changes in classroom structures and use of school time. Illustrated with slides. See #6, "The Third Thing," a tape showing Miss Hebert's class.

17. CITY AND SUBURB: A DIALOGUE
Miss Julie Honick, Miss Mary Herman
Seniors, Northwestern School of Education

Two reels. Students from John Marshall High School, Chicago, and Niles Township High School North discuss issues of concern to high school students: dress codes, the failure of the schools, grades, discipline, community control, bussing, student power, and the role of the teacher. See also #21, "The Death of English Education."

18. GROUP THEMES WITH MEANING
Esmor Jones
English Editor, Pergamon Press, Oxford, England

Speaker describes his experiences as an English teacher who moved from a position in which he depended heavily upon pre-planned textbook materials to a position in which he came to depend more on his own experience and the interests and needs of his students. He speaks of the use of themes arising out of students' interests that give direction to group or individual projects. The teacher and child are seen as cooperating in the making of curriculum. See demonstration tape #2, "Self-Direction in the Language Arts."

19. LANGUAGE, EXPERIENCE, AND THE PROCESS OF COMPOSING
Stephen Judy
Northwestern University

The speaker discusses the nature of the writing process and the idiosy crasies of individual writers and suggests ways in which the process of writing can be made meaningful and realistic in the classroom. See demonstration tapes #5, "The Skating Rink," and #6, "The Third Thing."

20. ISCPET DEMONSTRATION TAPE
Dennis Moore, Stephen Judy
Northwestern University

Produced after the first year of videotaping efforts, this tape discusses the problems involved in videotaping in the schools and includes illustrative examples from various classroom demonstration tapes in the series.

21. A DISCUSSION WITH HAROLD ROSEN
Harold Rosen
London Institute of Education, University of London

Two reels. Mr. Rosen discusses a range of topics in the teaching of English, shares his own teaching experiences, characterizes the teaching of English in Great Britain, and responds to questions from the audience, twelve elementary and secondary school teachers participating in a summer independent study program. See also demonstration tapes #8, "Indians," and #10, "The Music of People."

23. INVOLVING STUDENTS WITH LITERATURE
Mrs. Lawana Trout
Northwestern University

Mrs. Trout demonstrates a variety of ways of involving students in literature. Tape includes presentations on the use of film, creative drama, prints, and visual and tactile materials. Recommends that students be involved in creating teaching materials. Shows techniques for reading and discussion of short stories. Includes audience evaluation of techniques and the material being presented.

24. A CONVERSATION WITH RON WATSON
Ronald Watson

Mr. Watson, director of a storefront school in New York City, discusses the ways in which his school attempts to involve dropouts. Advises that teachers bring about changes from within the system rather than withdrawing from it. Questions from the audience, which consists of teachers from the Elk Grove-Arlington Heights Area. See tape #17, "City and Suburb: A Dialogue."

25. A DISCUSSION WITH ANDREW WILKENSEN
Andrew Wilkensen
University of Birmingham, England

Mr. Wilkensen discusses his research in oral language and suggests possible applications in the teaching of English. Sees English as "verbalization of experience and our experience of the verbalization of others." Sees the components of reading, writing and speaking as providing rich experiences in the classroom and moving outside the classroom when possible. Short discussion period with students in an undergraduate methods course.

26. WONDER? WRITER
Sister Mary Clare Yates
Our Lady of Mercy High School, Farmington, Michigan

The project's first and last experiment in educational television. Sister discusses and demonstrates the importance of perception in descriptive writing. The problems created by inaccurate observations are shown through four dramatizations. Includes background music, a wide range of visual materials, showcards, and a cast of ten. An interesting and useful tape, but too much work.